

R E M A R K S

The Office Action Summary states that claims 2-4, and 18 were objected to, and claims 1, 5-17, and 19-21 were rejected.

To present this amendment with the least number of deletions and insertions, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 2 (rather than amending claim 2 to incorporate the limitations of its base claim - claim 1). As amended, it is believed that claim 1 is allowable, and so are all of the claims that depend on claim 1 and that meet the requirements of 35 USC 112.

Objected to claim 18 is amended to make it independent, while incorporating therein the limitations of its base claim. Additionally, a minor “proper antecedence basis” problem is corrected (in the last line of the claim). As amended, it is believed that claim 18 overcomes the objection.

Although the Office Action Summary does not reveal this, according to the comments at page 2 of the Detailed Action, claims 5, 8, 14 and 21 are objected to; presumably, contrary to 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to claims 5 and 8. Since claim 21 is withdrawn, no comments are offered regarding the objection to claim 21.

As for claim 5, the Examiner states “how the mapping functions P and Q are algorithmically determined?” Applicants’ response is: “*In any way whatsoever, as long as it is pursuant to an algorithm.*” Admittedly, such a definition is broad. However, applicants believe that they are entitled to such a broad definition, unless there is art that prevents it.

As for claim 8, the Examiner asserts that the phrase “an identifier that is instrumental in routing said packet” is vague. Applicants respectfully disagree. The claim specifies (from its dependence on claim 1) that an element in a second network sends an address **Y** to an element in a first network, and that a packet arriving at the second network with an address **Y** is mapped to an address **X**, which is the address of the element that sent the address **Y**. The claim further specifies a step of communicating an identifier from that element in the second network. The claim does not specify when this identifier is communicated, or sent. It could be concurrently with the sending of address **Y**, or it could be at any other time. The claim does not specify what is contained in, or

constitutes, the identifier. The claim also does not specify the manner by which the identifier is communication. Therefore, the claim is broad enough to encompass any time of communicating, in any manner, of anything that can be classified as an identifier. The only limitation that the claim imposes is that the identifier is "instrumental in routing said packets," that is, packets that arrive at the second network, "from said first network to said second network." Respectfully, there is nothing vague about claim 8 and, therefore, it should not be objected to. It has some broad aspects, but unless there exists art that prevents expressing claim 8 with those broad terms, the claim should not be rejected or objected to.

As for claim 14, the typographical error in the claim is corrected and, as amended, it is believed that the claim overcomes the objection.

In light of the above amendments and remarks applicants respectfully submit that all of the Examiner's objections and rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance of the remaining claims 1, 3-20 are respectfully solicited.

Dated: 7/22/04

Respectfully,
John C. Brown
Larry A. Russell

By 
Henry T. Brendzel
Reg. No. 26,844
Phone (973) 467-2025
Fax (973) 467-6589
email brendzel@comcast.net